UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/803,870	03/12/2001	Philippe Morin	9432-000134	9173

27572   7590   09/30/2008
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER
VO, HUYEN X

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/803,870	MORIN, PHILIPPE
	Examiner	Art Unit
	HUYEN X. VO	2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 August 2007*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *3/2/2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new

ground(s) of rejection in view of Rozak et al. (USPN 5748191), necessitated by claim

amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless – (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed
> publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to
> the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rozak

(USPN 5748191).

4.   Regarding claim 23, Rozak discloses a method of navigating a multilevel menu

structure within an electronic product (*referring to figures 2-5*), comprising the steps of:

identifying a first location within said multilevel menu structure by user navigation

through a series of menu levels and sub-menu levels of said multilevel menu structure

(*referring to figures 2-5 for multilevel menu*) to reach a particular menu item of interest

at the first location (*col. 3, line 28 to col. 4, line 67, recording user's navigation path*

through a multilevel menu for use in creating voice command);

upon arrival at said first location, obtaining a first utterance of speech (*col. 2,*

lines 48-67, training);

associating said first utterance with said first location and generating therefrom a

stored first location (*col. 5, lines 24-67*);

obtaining a second utterance of speech (*col. 2, lines 64-67*); and

matching said second utterance with said first utterance to identify said stored

first location within said multilevel menu structure (*col. 6, lines 30-45*); and

navigating to said first location (*col. 6, lines 30-45*).

5.   Regarding claim 24, Rozak discloses a method of navigating a multilevel menu

structure within an electronic product (*referring to figures 2-5*), comprising the steps of:

identifying a user-selected navigation path through said multilevel menu structure

to a first location within said multilevel menu structure by user navigation through a

series of menu levels and sub-menu levels of the multilevel menu (*referring to figures 2-*

5 for multilevel menu) in order to reach a particular item of interest at said first location

(*col. 3, line 28 to col. 4, line 67, recording user's navigation path through a multilevel*

menu for use in creating voice command);

upon arrival at said first location, obtaining a first utterance of speech (*col. 2,*

lines 48-67, training);

associating said first utterance with said navigation path (*col. 5, lines 24-67*);

obtaining a second utterance of speech (*col. 2, lines 48-67*);

matching said second utterance with said first utterance to retrieve said

navigation path associated with said first utterance (*col. 6, lines 30-45*); and

using said retrieved navigation path to navigate to said first location within said

menu (*col. 6, lines 30-45*).

6.   Regarding claim 25, Rozak discloses a voice binding system to aid in user

operation of electronic devices, comprising:

a menu navigator that provides a traversable, multilevel menu structure offering a

plurality of predefined menu locations and allows a user to navigate through a series of

menu levels and sub-menu levels of said multilevel menu structure (*referring to figures*

2-5 for multilevel menu) to an item of interest at one of said predefined menu locations

within said multilevel menu structure (*col. 3, line 28 to col. 4, line 67, recording user's*

navigation path through a multilevel menu for use in creating voice command);

a speech recognizer having an associated lexicon data store (*col. 5, lines 62-67;*

voice command table);

a processor for adding user-defined speech to said lexicon upon arrival at said

one of said predefined menu locations (*col. 5, lines 62-67; adding new voice command*

to voice command table); and

a voice binding system coupled to said menu navigator for associating said user-

defined speech with said one of said predetermined menu locations within said menu

structure, and operable to traverse to said one of said predefined menu locations in

response to a spoken utterance corresponding to said user-defined speech (*col. 5, line*

62 to col. 6, line 25; navigating to a desired location within the menu based upon the

input voice command).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 1-9, 15-18, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Rozak (USPN 5748191) in view of Rigsby et al. (USPN 6556971).

9.   Regarding claims 1-2, Rozak discloses a method of navigating a menu structure

within an electronic product (*referring to figures 2-5*), comprising the steps of:

        identifying a path sequence by which a first location within a multilevel menu

would be reached by user navigation to said first location during a voice binding training

mode via sequential manipulation of a manual user interface of said electronic product

performed by a user in order to navigate through a series of menu levels and sub-menu

levels of the multilevel menu in order to reach a particular item of interest at the first

location (*col. 3, line 28 to col. 4, line 67, recording user's navigation path through a

multilevel menu for use in creating voice command*).

        upon arriving at said first location, obtaining a first utterance of speech

comprising at least one word chosen by a user of said electronic product (*col. 2, lines

48-67*);

storing said first utterance of speech chosen by said user as a model in a user-built lexicon (*col. 5, lines 24-67*);

associating said first utterance with said path sequence by which said first location would be reached and generating therefrom a stored first location (*col. 5, lines 24-67*);

obtaining a second utterance of speech (*col. 2, lines 64-67*);

matching said second utterance with said model of said first utterance to identify said stored first location within said menu (*col. 6, lines 30-45*);

subsequently navigating to said first location in response to said matching by automatically performing said path sequence (*col. 6, lines 30-45*).

Rozak et al. fail to specifically disclose upon said identifying, making a determination whether said first utterance already exists in association with said path sequence and, conditioned on results of the determination, prompting the user to provide said first utterance if it does not yet exist. However, Rigzby et al. teach upon said identifying, making a determination whether said first utterance already exists in association with said path sequence and, conditioned on results of the determination, prompting the user to provide said first utterance if it does not yet exist (*col. 10, lines 20-26, training*).

Since Rozak and Rigsby et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Rozak by incorporating the teaching of Rigsby et al. in order to enable the user to create customized voice command for the selected

navigation path so that future navigating interactions through the multilevel menu can be

minimized.

10.   Regarding claim 15, Rozak discloses a voice binding system to aid in user

operation of electronic devices, comprising:

a menu navigator that provides a traversable, multilevel menu structure offering a

plurality of predefined menu locations, wherein said menu navigator is operable to allow

a user to identify a path sequence for navigating through said multilevel menu structure

to one of said predefined menu locations via sequential manipulation of a manual user

interface of said menu navigator that results in user navigation during a voice binding

training mode through a series of menu levels and sub-menu levels through said

multilevel menu structure in order to reach an item of interest at said one of said

predefined menu location (*col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 67, recording user's navigation

path for use in creating voice command*);

a speech recognizer having an associated lexicon data store (*col. 5, lines 62-67;

voice command table*);

a processor for adding a first utterance of user-defined speech to said lexicon

(*col. 5, lines 62-67; adding the new voice command to the voice command table*); and

a voice binding system coupled to said menu navigator for associating said first

utterance, obtained upon arrival at said one of said predefined menu locations

during said voice binding training mode, with said path sequence for navigating to said

identified one of said predefined menu locations within said menu structure (*col. 5, line*

62 to col. 6, line 25; navigating to a desired location within the menu based upon the

input voice command), wherein said menu navigator is operable to traverse to said

identified menu location in response to a second spoken utterance corresponding to

said user-defined speech by automatically performing said path sequence (*col. 5, line*

62 to col. 6, line 25; navigating to a desired location within the menu based upon the

input voice command), and wherein said voice binding system, upon manual of

identification of said path sequence by said user (*col. 5, lines 16-35; manual selection of*

navigation path).

Rozak fails to specifically disclose making a determination whether said first

utterance already exists in association with said path sequence and, conditioned on

results of the determination, prompting the user to provide said first utterance if it does

not yet exist. However, Rigsby et al. teach making a determination whether said first

utterance already exists in association with said path sequence and, conditioned on

results of the determination, prompting the user to provide said first utterance if it does

not yet exist (*col. 10, lines 20-26, training*).

Since Rozak and Rigsby et al. are analogous art because they are from the

same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of invention to modify Rozak by incorporating the teaching of Rigsby et al. in

order to enable the user to create customized voice command for the selected

navigation path so that future navigating interactions can be minimized.

11.   Regarding claims 3-5, 17-18, and 21-22, Rozak further discloses the method and system of claims 2 and 15, respectively, further comprising storing said navigation path as a sequence of navigation steps leading to said first location (*col. 5, lines 24-67*), and storing said navigation path as a semantic sequence of navigation steps leading to said first location (*col. 5, lines 24-67*), and wherein said menu structure includes associated text and said method further comprises storing said navigation path as a semantic sequence of text associated with the navigation steps leading to said first location (*col. 5, lines 24-67; associating navigation path with newly trained speech command*).

12.   Regarding claim 16, Rozak further discloses the voice binding of claim 15, wherein said menu navigator includes at least one navigation button operable to traverse said menu structure (*referring to figures 2-5*).

13.   Regarding claims 6-9, Rozak further discloses the method of claim 2 further comprising constructing a speech model associated with said first utterance and associating said speech model with said navigation path (*col. 5, lines 24-67*), using a speech recognizer to compare said first and second utterances in performing said matching step (*col. 6, lines 1-45, speech recognizer*), constructing a speech model associated with said first utterance and using said speech model to populate the lexicon of a speech recognizer (*col. 5, lines 62-67, adding new command to table*); and using said speech recognizer to compare said first and second utterances in performing said matching step (*col. 6, lines 1-45, speech recognizer*), wherein said step of identifying a

user-selected navigation path comprises displaying said first location on a visible

display associated with said electronic product and prompting said user to provide said

first utterance (*col. 5, lines 24-35*).

14.   Claims 10-14 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over by Rozak (USPN 5748191) in view of Rigsby et al. (USPN 6556971),

and further in view of De Armas et al. (USPN 5873064),

15.   Regarding claims 10-14 and 19-20, Rozak further discloses providing user

feedback of the association between said first utterance and said navigation path by the

first location on a visible display associated with the electronic product (*col. 5, lines 24-*

35, displaying interaction log for user to select), but fail to specifically disclose the step

of providing user an audio feedback of the first utterance, the feedback is a textual

representation using a speech recognizer, and feedback is provided upon user's

request. However, De Armas et al. teach the step of providing user an audio feedback

of the first utterance (*Fig.1A, elements Child 1, OK and CANCEL; col.5, ln.2-15 and*

col.9, ln. 49-61), the feedback is a textual representation using a speech recognizer

(*decoded phrase*), and feedback is provided upon user's request (*Fig. 2, col. 6, ln.19-*

28; col. 8, 1n.25-29 and col.9, ln.19-61).

Since Rozak and De Armas et al. are analogous art because they are from the

same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of invention to modify Rozak by incorporating the teaching of De Armas et al. in

order to enable the user to confirm input command to train for a particular function.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to HUYEN X. VO whose telephone number is (571)272-

7631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Huyen X Vo/   9/26/2008
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626